G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1902-03
~~191~~ .

(Muzrai)

File No. 253

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month

SUBJECT.

Complaint against the principal of H H the Maharaja's Anna Chattram at Mysore (Re Kangalavathi Charity)

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:— Complaint ag[ainst] some of the servants H. H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore —

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 94 dated 18th J 190–
from Offg the Palace Mysore.

In October 1902 Petitions were

Nos 753 & 874 dated 25th October 1902

in this office complaining against the ~~Head~~ Parpathegar of His Highness the Maharaja's Chattram at. The petitions which were alleged to from one Nagesa Rao, ~~and~~ were forwarded to Palace Controller for

a

a detailed report The Palace Controller referred these Petitions to the Dharmadarsees, two of whom viz Messrs Ambale Anniah Pandit and G. Lakshminaranappa have submitted the result of their examination of the Chattram Accounts. The other three Dharmadarsees Viz Messrs Sundara Sastry, Kasturi Rangachar and Krishniengar (Advocate) were not consulted in the matter; because it is reported that the first was sick and the 2nd & the 3rd were not in the station.

2. The irregularities pointed out by the investigating Dharmadarsees are as follows:—

No 18 dated 27th Dec 1902

Slip A

(i) That 60 seers of rice were disbursed instead of 30 seers, in July 1901, to one Mádi, holder of Ticket No 309, one of the recipients of 'Kangalorakki';

(ii) that while only 11¼ seers of rice were properly payable to one Hameeda Bi, one of the Kangalorakki recipients (Ticket No 519), 15 seers were shown in the Ledger for the months of July, August and September 1907;

(iii) that some of the entries for August 1907 in the Account Book were altered as follows after the distribution, and payment made as per altered account

Ticket No

260. Ameena Bi 10 seers altered into 15.

192 Sydabi ~~do~~ 15 into 25

196 Fatmabi ~~do~~ 15 into 25

No 244 Mandi Hayat 10 seers into 15.

270	Tutmahi	10	"	30
272	Áshábi	10	"	30
546	Andha Rasulkhan	10	"	30

Total 80 seers altered into 170.

(iv) that false accounts were submitted to the Palace Controller's Office as follows:—

For the month of.	Correct quantity according to the Ledger	Quantity shown in the monthly accounts submitted to the Palace Contr's Office.
June 1901 :—	5786¼ seers.	5866¼ seers
July " :—	5760 "	582$\overset{8}{4}$¾ "
August " :—	5533¾ "	5610 "
September " :—	5486¼ "	5682½ "
October " :—	5320 "	5366¼ "
November " :—	5636¼ "	5763¾ "
December " :—	5324¾ "	5528¾ "
Total	38847¼ seers	3964$\overset{6}{2}$¼ seers

Excess being 79$\overset{1}{8}$ seers.

(V) That although the number of people fed in the Chattram from June 1901 may be estimated to be is comparatively small, owing to the prevalence of Plague in the Mysore City, and although the average consumption of rice may be estimated at 11½ Pallas per mensem, the following quantities are shown as expended or in addition to Nibhani allowances:—

In June 1901:— 18 Pallas
" July " 19 "
" August " although there was Guest-santarpane on account of the Installation } 11 "
In September 1901:— 19 "
" October " although there was no cooking for 5 days in the evening. 20 "

(vi) that from the statements of the Chattram man Raju, and Moda as well as from that of the Kumki Parpathegar, it might be observed that the ~~Head~~ Parpathegar Lakshmi-narasiah had given cooked food, ghee and rice ~~given~~ to his concubine and her people;

(vii) that the ~~Head~~ Parpathegar had put a stop to the system of receiving the Saiturpane provisions in the presence of the Dharmadarsees

(viii) that the monthly accounts were not being submitted to the Palace Controller's Office through the Dharmadarsees in pursuance of the Govt. orders

(ix) that receipts ~~some~~ of provisions from the Contractor were not recorded in the same book as was the practice 3 years before.

(x) that the Cash Regr was not maintained in a bound book and not written up datewar;

and (xi) that the amount payable to the Vegetables Supplier Naraniengar for the previous months had not been paid to him, although shown in the accounts as having been paid.

As regards the 1st charge, the Dharmadarsies have produced "[illegible]" for January to

December 1901, which shows that against the Ticket No 309 were shown 30 + 30 seers in the month of July 1901, but with the remark "[illegible]"; thereby showing that she had not received her dues of 30 seers in the previous month and that therefore 60 seers were given in the subsequent month. But the [illegible] for June 1901 shows that she ~~was~~ had been given 30 seers for that month also – Hence double payment No explanation is forth-coming on this point.

Slip B

× Slip D.

~~So, this charge appears to be not properly based.~~

As regards the second charge that instead of 11¼ seers, 15 seers were shown in the months of July, Aug: September 1901, the fact is borne out by the [illegible]" for January to December 1901; but the [illegible] Books of [illegible], July ~~and~~

Slip C.

July, August & Sept

Slips E, F, G. according to which payment shew the correct payment only.

Viz 11¼ seers, Thus the charge fails, there being no excess payment.

As regards the 3rd charge viz that certain figures in the [illegible] for August 1901 were altered, the fact is borne out by

Slip H. the Register in question, although the [illegible] for January to December '01 shew the correct figures in the month under reference

As regards the fourth Charge that false accounts were submitted to the Palace Controller's Office :—

The Dhurmadarsees state that false accounts were framed and submitted.

to the Palace Controller's Office as ~~shown~~ noted in page 3 of this note. But on examination of the disbursement Registers for the months of June, July, August and September 1901 that is 4 out of the 7 months under reference, the result is found to be in favour of the Chattram Servants during the first 3 months, the figures varying in the month of September only. As to the other three months viz October, November and December 1901, the Disbursement Registers have not been received to enable this Office to check how far false accounts were framed in ~~those~~ three months as alleged by the Dharmadarsees. The result of the Examination of the disbursement Registers from June to September 1901 is noticed below :—

X slip 2.

For the month of :- (1)	Correct quantity "according to the Ledger" as alleged by the Dharmadarsees. (What Ledger is not clear) (2)	X Quantity shown in the monthly accounts submitted to the Palace Controller's office.	Figures arrived at on Examination of the disbursement Registers
June 1901 :—	5786¼	5866¼	X 5866¼
July " :—	5760	5828¾	5828¾
August " :—	5533¾	5610	5610
September " :—	5486¼ X	5682½ ..135....	5547½ X
October " :—	5320	5366¼	Registers for these 3 months not received to enable this office to check.
November " :—	5636¼	5763¾	
December " :—	5324¾	5528¾	

From the above it is

seen that in the months of June, July and August 1901 the accounts submitted to the Palace Controller's Office tally with the figures shown in the monthly Disbursement Register and that no difference can be found out in respect thereof. But as regards September 1901, there is really a difference of one hundred and odd seers.

The Dharmadarsees report that the figures shown in the 2nd Column in the above statement are as per statement × furnished to them by the Muzrai Gumasta Subbraya of

× slip J

of the Palace Controller's Office, but from what Ledger these figures were taken is not very clear. Besides, the statement is not ~~signed~~ attested by the Offg Palace Controller.

As regards these discrepancies in the Kangalwakki" accounts, the Dharmadarsees (Messrs Ambale Anniah Pandit and Lakshminaranappa) took a statement from the Parpathegar Lakshminarasiah on the 22nd December 1902, in which the latter stated that the duty of checking the Kangalwakki Accounts involved on the Deputy

slip K.

Deputy Parpatthegar, ~~and~~ and that therefore

~~that he had nothing to~~

~~who~~ the latter was solely responsible

for any discrepancy in

the said Accounts.

The Dy Parpatthegar

Lakshmana Rao also

gave a statement before the Dharmadarsis on the slip 2

23rd December 1902, that

he had nothing to do with

the preparation and submission

of the Kangalwakki Accounts;

that he used to dictate

the ticket nos &c to the Shanbhogue

at the time of distributing

the rice, who entered the

particulars in the Disbursement

Register; that whenever

the Shanbhogue ~~was~~

happened to be absent at

the time of distribution of rice

the

~~Shanbhogue~~, the Parpathegar (Lakshmi narasiah) dictated the numbers &c, while he (Lakshmana Rao) or any one else entered in the Register; that it was the duty of the Shanbhogue to total up the daily disbursed quantities in the disbursing Register and to transfer the entries into the Ledger book; that the Ledger was not usually written up at the time of disbursement, it being done by the Shan-bhogue 2 or 3 days later on; that the disbursing Dharmadarsi's signature was generally obtained to the Register before the ~~daily totals~~ or figures were totalled up for the day, by reason that it would take a long time; that as he observed once or twice the Parpathegar having sent by the Chattram servant [illegible] bags of rice from the Chattram store, some suspicion arose in his mind, which induced him to examine the Disbursing Regrs for June, July & August 1901; that thereupon having seen clearly that the figures had been tampered with, he immediately brought it to the notice of the Parpathegar, who pleaded that it might have been due to the oversight of the Shanbhogue and asked him to keep quiet; and that thereupon he numbered the pages of the tampered Regrs lest ~~it~~ they might not eventually be replaced. He finally added that the Parpathegar had not allowed him to do anything with the "Kungalarakki" item and that he was always engaged in Santarpane business

The Dharmadarsies do not seem to have taken any statement from the Shanbhogue -

✓ Regarding the first four charges enumerated above, the Offg Palace Controller, Mr Nanjundaraj Urs reports in the letter under reply that regarding Kangalakki, the Dharmadarsies have made a clear case against the Parpathegar; that the alterations made in the accounts of August 1901 according to which payments were made, are as clear as anything; that they have been made after the distribution of rice to the parties in the presence of the Dharmadarsees; that the Parpattegar deposed before him that the Shanbhogue (Shamanna) had the possession of the accounts, and that he might have made the alterations; and that he signed the accounts fully believing the same to be correct, as it had been attested by the Shanbhogue and the Dy Parpattegar.

Slip M.

The Offg Palace Controller further states that he examined the Dy Parpattegar and that he stated that only

the

Slip N.

the Parpattegar and the Shanbhogue had been attending to the Bangalore Akki accounts, which were consequently not signed by him. In the deposition he has however admitted that he used to affix his signature to the monthly accounts submitted to the Palace Controller's office, such as ಜಮಾಖರ್ಚು, ರೋಜ್‌ಕಿರ್ದಿ, [illegible], ಖತಾವಣಿ, ತಾ ಜಮಾಖರ್ಚು &c.

As regards the Shanbhogue, the Oppg Palace Controller states that at the time of examination he gave any amount of trouble in giving replies to the questions asked ; and that in his deposition he stated that the Dy Sarpathygar was responsible for the accounts but that his statement is unreliable, it being contrary to what has been stated by the Sarpathygar. In the deposition he has however admitted that he used to total up the quantity of rice distributed immediately after the distribution was over; that the Dy Sarpathygar, who had the charge of the Disbursement Regr. under his custody, used to dictate to him the totalled figure for preparing the monthly accounts; ~~and~~ that the figures as

slip ⊗

well as the total entered in the Disbursement Regr for the month of August '01 in which certain alteration have been effected, are of his own handwriting; and that the figure altered in the case of the ticket-holder Syedabeebi (No 192, from 15 to 25 was at the dictation of the Dy Parpattegar at the time of the distribution

The Offg Palace Contr expresses as his opinion in this connection as follows:—

" I consider that the
" Shanbhogue's statement
" is very unreliable. He
" does not look to be a man
" of good character, so

I

"I am of opinion that
"such a person should
"not be kept in a place
"where there is room for
"committing fraud. I
"examined the accounts
"in dispute and found
"that the Dy Sarpattegar
"had not signed them.
"If he had anything to do
"with the accounts; surely,
"his signature would have
"been taken. It is the duty
"of the Sarpattegar, who has
"not got much work, to
"look to the accounts and
"have them compiled
"carefully but he has not
"done so. Now he says
"that the Shroubhope is
"responsible which I cannot
believe

"believe as the fraud was "not done in one month " but in successive months".

The original accounts submitted to the Palace Controller's Office have not been received, nor is it clear on what data the Palace Controller's Office checks and passes the bills in connection with "Kangalarukki".

As regards the fifth charge that more than the average estimated quantity of rice has been shown in certain months as having been expended for Santarpane &c, no explanation of either the Parpatheyar, or the Dy by Sarpathigar or the Shanbhogue, was obtained on the point, but however Mr Nanjundaraj also says that he paid a surprise visit on one noon and found that the attendance was about 50; and that this makes him think the Dharmadarsis' estimation to be fairly correct.

Regarding the 6th charge that the Chattram provisions &c were mis-appropriated by the Sarpathigar:—

The Sarpathigar denies in his statement before the Dharmadarsis, the fact of the alleged misappropriation of the Chattram provisions, and in his statement before the Offg Palace Controller this question was not raised.

In his statement before the Dharmadarsees the Dy Parupathigar stated that the Parupathigar sent from the Chattram Ugrana bags of rice through the Chattram gardener Munia on one or two occasions. But this point was not raised in his deposition before the Offg Palace Contr. Neither was the Shanbhogue questioned on the point.

Slip P

A boy of 16 years old one Nanjunda, who is the son of Kandigar Munda, deposed before the Offg Palace Controller that one night he went and delivered certain quantity + of ghee × about 10 seers

to the Sarpathugar's house from the Chattram and that he informed of the same to his father the next morning. But Mundu, father of the above said Muniyandu has given a different statement, that his son told him that the ghee was taken to the dancing girl's house and not to the Sarpathugar's house. Slip Q.

In this respect the Offg Palace Controller states that he examined 3 witnesses and that the statements of the two of them were contradictory to each other as noted above. He has given no opinion on this point.

The 7th, 8th ~~and~~ 9th & 10th
Charges

Charges brought by the Dharmadarsees have not been touched in the Offg Palace Controller's report under reply —

As regards the 11th Charge that the amount payable to the Vegetables Contractor Narasingar had not been paid to him:-

On the 16th May 1902 fuel contractor Narasingar presented a Complaint Petition to Mr G. Lakshmi-narasappa, one of the Dharmadarsees, stating that he had not received payment for the Vegetables supplied to the Chattram since August 1901. Mr Lakshminarasappa thereupon requested the Palace ~~Contractor~~ Controller to order for the production of the accounts ~~of~~ since August 1901, to enable him to find out the real truth of the Complaint petition. This request was accordingly complied with — In the meanwhile, i.e. that is, on the 18th May 1902, the said Nirumaniyar gave a statement before the Palace Controller also, but no action seems to have been taken by the latter (Mr V. N. Narasimha Iyengar) on this point. The Dharma-darsees in their subsequent report no 18 dated 27th December 1902, state that the fact of the non-disbursement of the amount due to the Contractor

slip R

slip S

Slip 9.

Contractor ~~was~~ is reported to be true. But it is not very clear from the Cash Register, whether the amount payable to the Contractor was really charged in the accounts, as having been paid to him. In the Offg Palace Controller's report, however, this item of charge against the Parpathegar has not been touched.

This is so far as the charges brought by the Dharmadarsis are concerned.

The Vernacular papers shew that there were two more charges against the Parpathegar viz

that he supplied provisions from the Chattram
to his Concubine, during
the Tulámása Santarpane
at Paschimavahini in
1901, and that he obtained on misrepresentation
sanction of the permanent
Palace Controller to give
11¼ seers of Kangalakki
per mensem to one Lakshmi Bayi,
daughter-in-law of the deceased Venku Bayi,
who was, in receipt of 22½
seers of rice — Regarding
the former charge, the
permanent Controller
took a statement from the Slip U
Chattram Kavalgar Raja
on the 20th May 1902, in
which he stated that the
Parpattegar's Concubine
remained at Paschimavahini
for 4 or 5 days and that
she and her party were

were supplied feeding articles. The permanent Palace Controller does not seem to have taken any action on this statement. In this connection the Offg Palace Controller states :—

"Regarding Palumasa
" Santarpane at Pas-
"-chimavahini only the
"Gollar of the Chattram
" had been examined
" on the 25th May 1902.
" He has stated before
" the permanent Controller
" that the Parpathegar
" had allowed his
" Concubine to remain
" there and that he
" supplied her and
her

" ~~for~~ her part of the
" articles intended for
" feeding the travellers
" during the season. Only
" one witness has been
" examined on this point
" and nothing has been
" done since then"

As regards the last charge brought by the Dy Sarpattagar viz the giving of 11¼ seers of rice to one Lakshmi Bayi:—

The records show that one Pandita Settappa, one of the Palace servants, thrown out of employ, was getting 22½ seers of rice per mensem from Kungalarakki. On his death in 1879, Mr T. Ananda Rao, the then in charge of the Palace, directed that the rice allowance be continued to her. She died

order no 620/L
dated 19-11-1879
slip II

Slip W

in 1899. Since then her daughter-in-law Lakshmi Bayi was given 11¼ seers of rice per mensem, but the authority for continuing half the quantity of rice is stated to be the order no 620 of 1879 quoted above. In submitting a list of the doubtful cases of the Vungulurakki recipients for the orders of the Palace Controller in Feby 1901 the Parpathegar states in the list that as per order no 620 Settappa's wife Venkoo Bayi and his daughter-in-law Lakshmi Bayi were both getting 22½ seers and that on the former's death in 1899, 11¼ seers were reduced and the balance viz 11¼ seers given to the latter.

On this Mr V. N. Narasimha Iyengar has recorded his order "Continue". Slip W

The Offg Palace Controller is of opinion that instead of discontinuing the allowance of 22½ seers on the death of Venkoo Bayi in April 1899, the Sarpathegar continued to give 11¼ seers to her daughter-in-law up to the 18th February 1902, when he obtained the Controller's orders to continue the same, on misrepresentation; and that he (Sarpathegar) has since avoided detection

Slip. X

detection by mixing his name in the statement with other names about whom he obtained orders either to continue or to dis-continue.

These are the facts gathered from the vernacular papers. Since In the petition read in his office from the Sarpotlagar Lakshmi-narasiah he states:-

(i) that the Chikka (Dy) Sarpotlagar purposely set up a young boy to give a false evidence against him that he took a certain quantity of ghee; and that there was no likelihood of his doing so, considering the presence of his sub-ordinates viz Dy

Parpathegar and the Shanbhogue;

(ii) That the amount payable to Vegetable Contractor Naranagar as well as the amount borrowed from others had to be utilized towards Talimkhana Santarpane and then reimbursed from the Tasdik amount of the latter, after the bill therefor was passed by Government; and that therefore the payment to the Contractor was delayed but that it was however ~~since~~ since paid off, immediately after the Santarpane amount was received, the receipt being duly sent to the Palace Controller's Office

(iii) That he had

never seen the original
order of 1879, regarding
the rice allowance due
to Venkoo Bayi. But that
as the Dy Sarpathegar, who
had been serving in the
Chattram even for the post 10 years
before his appointment
in the Chattram as Sarpathegar, had
written in the Ledger
Book in his own hand-
-writing asserting that
Venkoo Bayi and Lakshmi
Bayi were together getting
22½ seers, he had to
depend upon the Ledger
and the Dy Sarpathegar,
who had since tampered
with the entry — and which
has therefore been initialled
by the 'Offg Palace Contr

(iv) that the Shanbhogue has given a statement that entries in ~~it~~ the Kangalurakki Regr were dictated to him by the Dy Parpathegar, who in his turn states that these accounts were with the Shanbhogue; that it is clear from the records that the alterations were effected by the Shanbhogue and that the Dharmadarsees and the Dy Parpathegar and Shanbhogue were always intriguing against him; and that (v) the fact of the figures having been tampered with were brought to his notice, only at the time of enquiry.

And (v) that he has put in a long service of (40) years, having loyally discharged his duty.

The Dy Sarpathingar Lakshmana Rao had been transferred from the Chattram to the Sri Trimeswaraswami Temple and he died a few months ago —

The Chattram Shanbhogue Shanmuga whose statement the Offg Palace Controller has reported to be unreliable and whose character is also reported to be not good, was only a temporary hand and he was ~~since~~ recently thrown out of employ in connection with the restoration of the appointment to Vatta mutsaddi Krishnappa in the Sri Chamundeswari Ammanavaru temple, the permanent incumbent in the Chattram having been therefore re-transferred to the Chattram as per Govt Order no 1758 dated 3rd March 1903.

Now the chief points for consideration are:—

(i) Why was ~~the~~ an excess quantity of 30 seers of rice given to the ticket-holder no 309 in July 1901?

who is responsible to this double payment? ~~Is~~ Are there no Tickets supplied to each recipient, as in the case of the Gumbaz Langarkhana at Seringapatam, in which the quantities given are entered against the month for which it is due?

(ii) The figures altered in the Ledger Book for August 1901 are admitted to be in the hand-writing of the Shanbhoge Thimma who has also totalled up the figures according to his own alterations. If the accounts had been subd to the Palace Controller's office and money drawn according to the altered figures, who are all responsible in this connection

— whether the Parpathegar alone or the Parpathegar, the Dy Parpathegar and the Shanbhogue all together?

In totalling up the disbursed quantities of rice in the Disbursement Regr for September 1901, the Shanbhogue, in whose handwriting the figures are, has entered 135 seers of rice in excess — If payment has been made for this excess quantity also, who is responsible?

It is said by the Dharmadarsees that there were similar discrepancies in the Regrs for October, November and December 1901, Is it so? These Regrs have not been received in this

Office.

Who prepared the two (draft) accounts for August & September 1907 ~~first~~ and in whose hand-writing are they? What are the respective duties of the Sarpathegar, the Dy Sarpathegar and the Shanthogue?

On what data does the Palace Controller's office check and pass the bills in connection with "Vengulavakki" and why were not these discrepancies detected in that office then and there?

(iii) What was the average quantity of rice consumed

for the past ~~10~~ 5 or 10 years
under the heads "Santarpana
and "Nehavani"? How
does it compare with
the 5 months under reference
viz from June to October 1901

(iv) Is it true that the
amount payable to the
vegetable contractor
Narasingar was charged
in the accounts as having
been paid though not
actually paid? In the
Parpatyagar's petition he
states that his amount
had to be temporarily utilized
for Dakshinayana Santarpana
until the bill therefor
was passed - Is it so?

(v) In the matter of rice
allowance given to Lakshmi
Bogi

Bogi, who is responsible to this irregularity — whether the Parpathigar or the Dy Parpathigar and what is the permanent Controller's view in the matter?

What 7 is the opinion of the permanent Controller as regards the moral conduct and character of the Parpathigar Lakshminarasiah?

Submitted

ks
6/6/03

Note continued :-

The Palace Controller was addressed on all these points and he was requested to favour the first-noted with his opinion along with a detailed report on all the points. His detailed report No 114 dated 8th March 1904 is herewith submitted

Submitted

18/4/04

The Rice valued at Rs 135-4-a was paid in excess of the prescribed quantity. This amount has been made good now by the Parpetkar and others responsible for the mistake. The Palace Controller is requested to apportion the amount among these persons according to the degree of their responsibility and report how it may be recovered.

19. 4. 04

Note continued:—

As directed above, the

Palace Controller who
was addressed in the matter
reports that of the three
persons who were guilty
Lakshman Rao has died
~~&~~ that the second, Shambhu
Shamanna has been thrown
out of employment &
is too poor to pay any fine
and Lakshmi Narasappa is
the only survivor who pleads
that he ~~trusted~~ his subordinate.
The Palace Contr: states that
this excuse can only palliate
not excuse his fault. He
therefore proposes that $\frac{1}{3}$ of
the amount, viz Rs 45-1-4
may be recovered from Lakshmi
Narasappa at ~~a~~ monthly
instalments of Rs 5 & the

balance struck off

Submitted
10/6/04 DS

I think the Palace Controller's recommendation, which is a lenient punishment, may be sanctioned. Parpattegar Lakshmi Narsappa is an official of long standing who has rendered approved service for many years, but the irregularities brought to notice cannot be altogether left without notice.
Orders may accordingly be issued in accordance with the Palace Controller's suggestion.

Subd to the Dewan
through the 2nd Cr

no 29
4/7/04.

4/7/04

The value of the quantity of rice misappropriated by the ~~[illegible]~~ Chatram servants amounts to Rs 135-4-4. They have also been

brought forth with
our knowledge
with the accounts
of the 3 individuals
interviewed pre-
[illegible], and
these irregularities
[illegible]
any [illegible] Esq
Dr [illegible] as to
dead, the 2nd
[illegible], or
[illegible]
have been determined
and the only
Examining officer
to [illegible]
[illegible]
Palace [illegible],
who was con-
sulted in the
discovery of the
nature of these
being misapprop-
-riated is of
opinion that
one. [illegible]

It may be
ordered to be
recovered and
by this Court
deemed affirmed
by easy instal-
ments of Rs 50
p. m. This proposal
may be approved
and it may
be forwarded
to the Controller
Stated after
Schumann has
been dismissed
for misconduct
he should not
hereafter be
employed either
permanently
or temporarily
in any capacity
in other Govt.
institutions.
(Schumann appears
to have been

appointed as -
acting [illegible]
Sq. the Lakshmi
Ramanujam
temple)

T. [illegible]
7/7

Recd
10/7/04

[illegible] 11/7/04

185
12. VII. 04

437
Please ascertain
the pay & age of
Parpattiyagar Lakshmi
Narasayya.

To all the dis-advantages of the situation so pathetically described by the Complainant in the last paragraph of his letter the remedy seems to be not to lie in helpless contemplation of the difficulty but to increase the efficiency of the supervision & control. The Dharmadarsees seem to have been given a good deal of store control - which to what extent has not been exercised by the regular offl. controlling agency. How long this Parpattiyagar has been in this Chattram should also be ascertained.

20. VII. 04 [illegible]

The delay ~~[illegible]~~
in the Dist. Board
Office in [illegible] it was
taken up [illegible] Shanadar
is [illegible] unintelligible
[illegible]

Send [illegible] our remarks
with the information wanted
in 1st & final orders
are [illegible]

Inquire at once
[illegible] 21/7/04

[illegible]

Note continued

The Palace Controller, who was addressed on the subject, ~~states~~ has ~~in~~ submitted a statement of the services, pay &c of Sarpattegar Lakshminarasayya. From the statement it is observed that his present age is 55 years, that his pay is Rs 20/- and that he has put in a service of 39 years and 7 months, having been appointed in 1865.

with his letter no 14 dated

Submitted to the Dewan with reference to his remarks on the preceding page.

5/8/04

V Anantasami Rao
5/8/04

Subd to the Dewan

Dewan desires to see this individual. He may be kindly sent [illegible]).

Yes

Write to Palace Controller
Camp Magadi 11/8/04

Subd to the Dewan
Lakshmi Narasayya has come to Bangalore. He has been asked the Dewan. 27/8/04

1183
27 8 04

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial
No.

The result of the investigation does not show that there has been efficient control in this respect. As the Collector says that tickets have been issued under his signature and that the distribution of rice has been brought under a methodical arrangement it may be hoped that there will be no occasion for such irregularities in future. The Collector's recommendation to levy Rs 45 from the Parpattyagar may be approved. The Shanbhogue who has shown himself so unreliable must be removed from the Lakshmi Narayanaswami where he seems to have been employed. The accounts submitted by the Parpattyagar must be checked & examined in the Collector's office & in this & other respects the doings of the Chattram offls must be more efficiently supervised.

1.IX.04

9/04

No. 1112 En 2 D 24/11/02.
Muz F. 17-97

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petitions Nos 753 + 874 dated 25-10 1902 received at the Dewan's Office from one Nagesha Rao of Mysore Complaining against the Head Parpattegar of Govt Annachattram at Mysore city

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the Palace Controller, for a detailed report at a very early date

By Order,

Dfr

Dy ~~Muzrai~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE.
Nov 1902.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
MUZRAI
RECEIVED ON
Date 20-1-03
No. 5319
MUZRAI BRANCH

From The Palace Controller
~~DEPUTY SECRETARY~~, Mysore
~~GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE~~,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To
The Deputy Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore

Dated 16th January 1903
Despatched
Received
General No. 94
Muzrai F. No.

20/1/03

Enclosure No. 1 to 6

Submitting, detailed report on the petition of Nagesa Row and others &c. complaining of ~~certain~~ mis-appropriation of certain chattram articles by the Parpathy of H.H. the Maharajah's Chattram at Mysore and certain alterations made by him ~~without~~ in the accounts of the Chattram -

2/1/03 No: 94.

Palace Controller's Office
Mysore.
Dated 16th January 1903.
78

From

H.Nanjundaraj Urs,Esq.,
Offg.Palace Controller,
Mysore.

To

L.Anantasami Row,Esq.,
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Muzroi Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your No.1142/Muz.I.17-97 dated 24t November 1902 forwarding for report the petition of Nágésaro and others against the Párpatyagár of Maharaja's Chutter at Mysore, I have the honor to state that the petition was referred to the Dharmadarsís of the Institution for enquiry an report. Owing to the absence of many of the Dharmadarsis on Messrs.Lakshminárnappa and Amblé Pandit have enquired into the complaint and submitted a detailed report which is herewith submitted for orders of the Government.

2. Regarding Kangalara Akki , the Dharmadarsis have made a clear case against the Párpatyagár In the accounts of 4 months examined by them ~~that~~ they have found in the account of August that some of the entries have been altered and payments made as per altered accounts. The alterations are as clear as anything and they have been made after the distribution of ~~the~~ rice to the parties in the presence of the Dhamadarsis. The Párpatyagár, Deputy Párpatyagár and Shánbhog were examined regarding this false accounts. Before the Dhamadarsís, the Párpatyagár has thrown the whole responsibilit on the Deputy Párpatyagár but before me he has not only adted his responsibility but also has stated that [illegible]

has stated before the Dharmadarsís was incorrect. But when the accounts were shown and asked to be explained as to the altered entries made therein, he has further deposed that the Shánbhōg has the possession of the accounts, that he might have made the alterations and that he, the Párpatyagár, has signed the accounts, fully believing the same to be correct, as it had been attested by the Shánbhōg and the Deputy Párpatyagár. The latter who had been examined on this point has stated that he had nothing to do with the Mangalara Akki accounts as the Párpatyagár and Shánbhōg had been managing the same themselves, that he only used to render help at the time of distribution of rice to the parties and that he has signed the monthly accounts and not Mangalara Akki accounts which also forms a part of the monthly accounts of the Chutter. The Shánbhōg was examined after his return from leave. At the time of examination he gave any amount of trouble in giving replies to the questions asked. He deposed that the Deputy Párpatyagár was responsible for the accounts as he used to take charge of the same, after the distribution of rice, taking the signatures of the Dharmadarsís and Párpatyagár. This is contrary to what has been stated by the Párpatyagár, therefore I consider that the Shánbhōg's statement is very unreliable. He does not look to be a man of good character, so I am of opinion that such a person should not be kept in a place where there is room for committing fraud. I examined the accounts in dispute and found that the Deputy Párpatyagár had not signed them. If he had anything to do with the accounts, surely, his signature would have been taken. It is the duty of the Párpatyagár who has not got much work, to look to the accounts and have them compiled carefully but he has not done so. Now he says that the Shánbhōg is responsible which I cannot believe as the fraud was not done in one month but in successive months

3. While making enquiry on this point another irregularity was also brought to notice. That one Venkubáyi was getting 22½ sérs of rice and she died in April 1899, but the Párpatyagár

instead of discontinuing the allowance to her [illegible] continued to give 11¼ sérs to her daughter-in-law [illegible] February 1902, when he obtained the Controller's order [illegible] continue the same on misrepresentation. A copy of [illegible]der No.620 dated 19th November 18[illegible]9, as well as the original statement on which he has obtained the order to [illegible]tinue 11¼ sérs to the surviving daughter-in-law [illegible] submitted for reference. He has nicely avoided detection by mixing her name in the statement, with other names of whom he has obtained orders either to continue or discontinue.

4. Regarding misappropriation of the Chutter articl[illegible] three witnesses have been examined including the [illegible] patyagár. The Kávalgár stated that he was absent one day and that he learned from his son that the Parpatyagár had taken certain quantity of ghee to his dancing girl's house, but his son who took the same with the Parpatyagár said that he took it to the Parpatyagár's house. The Dharmakarsis, in their report, estimate the daily attendance of travellers to 50 but in the accounts of previous months a large number is shown. Owing to the prevalence of plague in a severe form, in those months the number of travellers could not be many, as people avoided coming to this place, unless forced by necessity. In order to know the actual state of things in the Chutter, I paid a surprise visit on one noon and found the attendance as about fifty. This makes [illegible] to think that the Dharmakarsis are fairly correct in their estimation.

5. Regarding Tulasa [illegible] at Paschimavahini ch[illegible] the Gollar of the Chutter has been examined on [illegible] 1902. He has stated before the permanent Controller that the Par-patyagár had allowed his concubine to remain there and that he supplied her and her party of the articles intended [illegible]ing the travellers [illegible] season. [illegible]

has been examined on this point and nothing has been done since then. The entire records including the Mangalara Akk accounts for the months of June, July, August and September 1901 are herewith submitted for reference and orders of the Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Offg. Palace Controller.

H.S.

Compd

No. 2533 D/
Muz F 17-97
16/6/03

Enc 1 file

To

The Palace Controller
Mysore

Dated June 1903.

Sir,

With reference to your letter no 94 dated 18th January 1903, bringing to notice certain irregulari-ties in His Highness the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore, I am directed to observe that ~~the records~~ on a careful of enquiry submitted by Mr Nanjundaraj Urs are not complete, and that instead of obtaining from the

÷ of the verna-
records and
* in his office,
x that the

the officials concerned, explanations on each and every point involved, so as to enable Govt- to pass final orders on the subject, their statements have been taken on more general points. The points on which clear explanations have to be obtained from the parties concerned are as follows:—

(i) From the "[illegible]" for January to December 1901 it is found that against the Ticket No 309 are shown 30+30 Rs in July 1901, with the note "[illegible]", thereby showing that the recipient had not received her dues for the previous month viz for June 1901. But the

Disbursement Regr for June 1901 shows that she had already been given 30 seers in that month. ~~This~~ It is not clear whether payments were made according to the former Regr or the latter, and whether there was actually double payment in this respect, ~~Apparently~~ [illegible] in which case the explanation of the Officer at fault should be obtained. It should

be reported if
nts have not been
to each of the
- in order that
quantity of rice or ragi
given may be entered
s after issue

(ii) As regards the second charge that instead of 11¼ seers of rice properly payable to the recipient of Ticket no 519 (Hameeda Bi), 15 seers were shown in the month of July, August and September 1901, the fact is borne out by the [illegible] of no 7 for January to December 1901. But the Disbursement Registers of the respective months show the correct quantity viz 11¼ seers only. It should be explained how the payment of money was made – whether for 15 seers or for 11¼ seers.–

(iii) Regarding the 3rd charge that certain figures in the Disbursement Regr for August 1901 were so tampered with after the distribution was over:—

It is observed that the [illegible] of no 7 for January to December 1901 show

shows the correct figures,
while the Regr for August 1901
shows that the figures
were actually altered, ~~it~~

Such alterations
being admitted to
have been effected
by the Shanbhogue
himself. It

is a point to be explained
how the payment was made
~~either~~ whether according to the
correct figures shown
in the former Register
or according to the
altered figures shown in the
latter Regr.

(iv) As regards the
fourth charge, the Dharma
-darsees state that
false accounts were
framed and submitted
to the Palace Controller's
Office from June to December 1907 but the examination
of the Regrs in question

in this office
shews the following
result :—

For the month of [illegible]	Quantity stated by the Dharmadarsis (How these figures were arrived at is not clear)	Quantity shown in the accounts subd to the Palace Contr's Office.	Figures arrived at on examn of the Dis-bursement Regr in this office
June 1901 :—	5786¼ Seers	5866¼ Seers	5866¼
July " :—	5760 Seers	5828¾ "	5828¾
August " :—	5533¾ "	5610	5610
September " :—	5486¼ "	5682½	5547½ X.
October :—	5320	5366¼	Regrs for these three months not in this office to check.
November :—	5636¼	5763¾	
December :—	5324¾	5528¾	

From the above it is seen that in the months of June, July & August 1901, the accounts submitted to the Palace Controller's Office tally with the figures shown in the ~~monthly~~ Disbursement Regr ~~for~~ for the respective months, except in the month of September 1901. How the figures shown by the Dharmadarsees were arrived at ~~and what~~ should be explained, and the explanation of the Officials concerned should be obtained & submitted as ~~to~~ regards the discrepancy in the accounts for September 1901. It should also be reported whether as alleged by the Dharmadarsees

any irregularities are found
in the accounts of Oct,
Nov. and December 1907
and on what quantities
payments were made for
the months of September,
October, November and
December 1907. What is
the opinion of the ~~present~~
Palace Controller in the
matter of these discrepancies
and who are all responsible
in the matter? If any
excess payment has been made
on the Treasury in
connection with these
- , what is the total
to thus ~~made~~ paid?
original Accounts
to these discrepancies
submitted

submitted to the Palace Controller's Office have not been received, nor is it understood on what data that ~~Palace~~ Office checks and passes the bills in connection with Kungalakki". Who prepared the rough or draft Accounts for August & September 1901 and what are the respective duties of the Parpathegar, the Dy Parpathegar and the Shanbhogue so far as these accounts are concerned.

As regards the fifth charge, the Dharmadarsis simply say that more

than

Hence the average estimated quantity of rice has been shewn in certain months in 1901 and Mr Mujumdar Qrs states in his report that his surprise visit on one noon makes him think that the Dharmadarsees' estimation is fairly correct. What was the average quantity of rice consumed every month for the past 10 years under the heads "Santarpane" and "Nihimi"? How does it compare with the 5 months under reference viz from June to October 1901?

In regard to the sixth charge:—
It is said ~~that~~ by the Dharmadarsees that

that Vegetable Contractor
one Narasimiengar complained
that he had not received
payment for the Vegetables
supplied to the Chattram
since August 1901, and
it is further stated by
him that the amount
had not been paid to the
said Contractor as alleged although
shown in the Accounts
as having been paid - The
Palace Controller has
not touched this point
in his letter to Govt
and it is not very clear
from the Cash Regr whether
the amount payable to him
~~have~~ has been actually
entered therein as having
been

been already paid. The Parpattiagar, in his petn× to this office states that the Contractor Narainiengar's allegation of non-payment of the amount due to him is true; that this amount had to be temporarily utilized towards Tulamasa Santarpane at Paschimavahini until the bill ~~for the latter~~ therefor ~~amount~~ had been duly passed by the Head Office, and that the payment to the Contractor had to be consequently delayed. Is it so? A clear report is required on this point.

× No 1852 dated 8/5/03

Lastly as regards the rice allowance of 11¼ seers per mensem having been continued to one ~~[illegible]~~ Lakshmibayi, Mrs

Mr Nanjundaraj Urs expresses it as his opinion that the Parpattegar Lakshmi-narasimh ~~must have~~ ~~explained~~ misrepresented the facts to the Palace Controller and obtained his signature to the statement alluded to. What is the Palace Controller's view in the matter ? and what is his opinion as regards the moral conduct and character of Parpattegar Lakshmanarasimh —

A clear and detailed report should be submitted on all / the points enumerated above together with the Salwee Controller's opinion on each -

The Encs are returned

I have &c

Dpl.

16/6/03

Dy Secretary

Es
16/6/03

No: 114 Encls. 1 file + 9 statements

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2307.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Palace Controller's Off
Mysore.
Dated 8th March 1904.

Received 22/3/04
regr + put
up refer cons.

From,

V.N.Narasimha Iengar,Esq.,
Palace Controller.

To

L.Anantasami Rao,Esq.,
Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Muzrai Department,
Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honor to reply seriatim as below to the interrogations contained in your letter No:2563 dated 16th June 1903.

2. Para (I) Disbursements have been made on the Batvade Book (Disbursement Register) involving the double payment of the item of 50 sers of rice against ticket No:30

3. Tickets of a sort were issued to the recipients of the Kangalara Akki doles but they had not been signed or registered. This defect has since been remedied, and regular tickets on the model of pension Rolls have been issued under the signature of the undersigned. Each monthly disbursement is noted thereon under the initials of the Chatram Parpatyagar.

4. Para (II). Payment was made of only 11¼ sers to H[illegible] Bi, ticket No:11

5. Para (III). Payment is made as per the altered figures in the Batvade Book.

6. Para (IV). There was a Ledger of issues prepared in the

said [illegible]

delay in paying the costs of the Paschimavāhini Santarpa of that year, and the money due to vegetable contractor Naraniengar was utilized for meeting that demand. The contractor complained to me, and on the Parpatayagar's explanation, I advised the former to wait for sanction o the Paschimavāhini feeding bill.

10. The Parpatyagar's further explanation dated 12-7-03 is submitted giving his version of the points animadverted on.

11. At the time the events under review occurred, th Chatram had a Deputy Parpatyagar named Lakshman Row, who died of plague on 2nd February 1903. The Shanbhog was Shámanna, who was thrown out of employ under the order of Government No: $\frac{176}{\text{Muz F 17-97}}$ D/23-7-02. He has since been taken on temporarily as acting Shanbhog in the Lakshmi Rámanasvami temple.

12. Adverting to para 2 of your letter under reply, I have deferred answering it till I have had sufficient opportunities of judging the Parpatyagar's character, with the perspective of the disclosures made in these records. I think that Parpatyagar Lakshmi Narasappa was more sinne against than sinning. From the Shanbhog's deposition , it is plain that the disbursements of rice, &c, were left practically to the deceased Deputy Parpatyagar, whose statement however betrays an animus against his superior I will not attempt to extenuate the Parpatyagar's faults, but in the light of the records, the utmost that can in my opinion be urged against him is gross carelessness. That he was wilfully and culpably pervert is not proved by the papers in the case. He has mended his ways, and I have

had no further cause to blame him since for anything worse than petty omissions,&c,.

13. Notwithstanding the precept " *de mortuis nil nisi bonum* ", it must be said of the Deputy Parpatyagar that his conduct in the said transactions does not appear to advantage. But he is past human judgment.

14. In judging the morale and conduct of the Muzrai Officials, I submit it is essential to bear in mind their environments. They are under-paid as compared with their compeers in other Departments, and their authority over matters and articles much coveted by the poor and needy is not inconsiderable. They have no pension, and it is not easy to replace the inefficient and untrustworthy among them by better men. The discharge of their daily routine is further an uphill work. Hence their actions demand in my thinking a more charitable construction than those of other public servants of a like standing.

15. The records connected with the case are resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Palace Controller.

T.L.

To No. 3408 of 20/4/04

The Palace Contr

Mysore

dated April 1904.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter No 114 dated 8th March 1904 regarding the irregularities in H. H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore

I am to request you

~~Read~~:

~~Correspondence ending with letter No 2307 dated 8th March 1904 from the Palace Controller in Mysore submitting a detailed report regarding the irregularities in H. H. the Maharaja's Annachattram at Mysore.~~

~~Order thereon: No~~

From the above it is evident that rice valued at Rs 1354-0 has been paid in excess of the prescribed quantity. This amount has to be made good now by the Parpathegar and others responsible for the mistake ~~The Palace Controller is requested~~ to apportion the amount among the above persons according to the degree of their responsibility and report how it may be recovered.

2. ~~Final orders will issue on receipt of the report called for regarding the Conduct of the Chattram servants concerned.~~

I have &c
&c,
29-4-'04

Dft.

Offg Secretary
Muz: Deptt.

ks
27/4/04

To
The Palace Controller in Mysore
" Comptroller, M. G.

1904.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3068
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

From V.N.Narasimmiyengar, Esq.,
~~THE~~ *PALACE CONTROLLER,*
Mysore.

To
M. Shama Rao, Esq.,
Offg.Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Muzroi Department.
Bangalore.

Ss
2/6/04

Refers

4

Dated 31st May 1904.

Despatched 1st June

Received

General No. 143
No

Enclosure No.

Sir,

In reply to your No: 3408 Dated - 30th Ult., I have the honor to state that, one of the trio in fault, Lakshman Rao, is no longer within reach of human law: The second is Shanbhog Shamanna, who has been thrown out, and-- is too poor at present to pay any fine that may be imposed on him.

2. There remains only the Parpatyagar Lakshmi Narsappa. His excuse is that he trusted his subordinates; but his

credulity can only palliate, not excuse his fault.

3. I would therefore propose that a 3rd of the defaulted amount (Rs135-4-0 ÷ 3.) =Rs45-1-4, may be recovered from this peccant official, at monthly instalments of Rs5/- and the balance struc off.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Palace Controller.

M.K.V.
Cpd.

Mysore

No: 429
23:7:04

To,
The Palace Controller
Mysore

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 143 dated 31st May 1904, I am directed to request information on the following points:—

(1) What is the pay and age of Parpattegar Lakshman Narasaiyya?

x (2) How long has he been in H.H. the Maharaja's Chattram and what service has he rendered?

2. The favour of an

early reply is requested.

I have &c

Dewan's order

23/7/04

Secy
Muz: Deptt

23/7/04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
-426.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

No: 14
Cur. 1.

1/8/04

[illegible]

Palace Controller's Office,
Mysore.
Dated 26th July 1904.
29th

From,

V.N.Narasimmiyengar, Esq.,
Palace Controller.

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Muzroi Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No:429 dated 23rd July 1904 I have the honor to forward herewith the statement of the services, pay, &c., of Parpatyāgār Lakshminarasayya of the Maharaja's Chatram.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

Palace Controller.

190

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

Statement showing the Services, &c. of Pārpatyāgār Lakshminarasayya.

Name.	Designation	Age			Pay			Date of appointment	Total service		Date of transfer to the Chatram	Date of last increment	Remarks.
		yrs	m	d	Rs	as	p		yrs	mts			
Lakshminarasayya.	Parpatyagar of the Maharaja's Chatram Mysore	55	.	.	20	.	.	6th January 1865.	39	7	September 1897.	December 1899.	Was Parpatyagar of the Prasanna Krishnasvami temple till 1897, when he was transferred to the Maharaja's Chatram. His pay has since been raised to Rs 20/-

Palace Controller's Office
Mysore.
Dated 25th July - 1904

Palace Controller.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
~~Deputy~~ Secretary to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department

To

The Palace Controller,
Mysore

Dated August 1904.
Despatched 17th
Received
General No. 741
Muzrai F. No. 17-97
Enclosure No.

Sir,

With refce to your letter No. 14, dated the 26th July 1904, forwarding a statement of services, pay etc of Lakshmi Narasayya, Parpattegar of H. H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore, I am directed to request that you will be so good as to direct the official in question to ~~report himself~~ wait upon the Dewan at an early date. ~~to this office at a very early date.~~

I have &c,

Dewan's order

Ks
16/8/04

17/8/04
Secy, Muz: Dept

MGCPB—1000—21-1-01

Muzrai

Read:-

Petitions Regd. Nos. 753 and 874, dated 25th October 1902, from one Nagesa Rao, complaining against some of the servants of H H the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore.

And,

Correspondence ending with letter No. 14, dated 26th July 1904, from the Palace Controller, Mysore, submitting a detailed report on the above

Yes. Please send draft and fair copies. 3/10/04

Subd. The fair copies of this order have been despatched

Order thereon

no: 1321-2 / m: 7: 17-97 Dt 4-10-04.

Certain irregularities in H. H. the Maharaja's Chattram having been brought to the notice of Govt, the Palace Controller requested to [illegible] into

In October 1902, ~~the above~~ petitions were received from one Nagesa Rao complaining against the Parpattegar and others of the Chattram at Mysore. The Palace Controller to whom they were referred for report, referred them in his turn to the Dharmadarsis of the Palace Muzrai Institutions Messrs Amble Annaiah Pandit and G. Lakshmi Naranappa who were the only Dharmadarsis then present at Mysore, examined the Chattram accounts and reported the results thereof to the Offg Palace Controller, Mr. H. Nanjunda Raj Urs.

2. Among the irregularities thus brought to light by the Dharmadarsis, only two of them ~~deserve mention. They are (1)~~ ~~that~~ a double ~~entry~~ payment of 30 seers of rice ~~had been~~ was made in the

and report
upon the relating items
Chattram a/c [illegible]
[illegible]
submitted
by ~~the Palace Controller~~ him
it is observed that
among the ~~[illegible]~~
irregularities brought
to light only two
are serious ones
deserving ~~mention~~ notice,
viz, (1) that

case of one of the recipients of the Kangalarakki charity; and (2) that false accounts had been prepared and submitted to the Palace Controller for the 7 months from June to December 1901

~~1901. [illegible]~~

~~2. The permanent Palace~~ ~~then~~ ~~Controller Mr V N. Narasimmiengar while reporting on the above results, states as regards item (1) that a double payment has been made and as regards item (2) that the accounts have been made in the handwriting of the late Dy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao and were totalled at the instance of the Dharmadarsis by Gumastah Subba Rao for the said 7 months but~~

The Palace Controller Mr. V. N. Narasimha Iyengar reports, after full enquiry ~~[illegible]~~ in regard to the first named irregularity, that, as a ~~the fact of [illegible]~~ matter of fact, a double payment ~~[illegible]~~ was actually ~~been~~ made in the case of one of the recipients of the charity ~~[illegible]~~ and in regard to the second, he states that wrong accounts were sent to his office by ~~[illegible]~~ the Chatram officials from June to Decr. 1901, ~~of Rs. 135-5-4 [illegible]~~ And that after examination it was found that a sum of Rs. 135-5-4 had been shown ~~[illegible] in excess of~~ ~~and away~~ during that period in excess of the actual amount due on the rice supplied to the Chattram ~~He~~

~~that the same being unreliable, a correct account was prepared in the Controller's Office, for that reason, on the monthly Issue Registers, and that payments were~~ ~~had been~~ ~~however made on the monthly *Kharch* patties received from the Chattram, according to which rice valued at Rs 135. 5. 4 was paid in excess of the correct quantity.~~

4. On a consideration of the facts set forth above, the Govt. observe that the result of the investigation does not show that there has been efficient control in the matter of the distribution of Kangalarakki But as the Palace Controller says that tickets have been issued under his signature to each of the recipients of the

He holds three of the chief Chattram servants responsible for these irregularities viz the Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasayya, the Dy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao and the Shanbhog Shamanna; and further recommends that as the second of the three has since died and the third has been thrown out of employ being a temporary hand one-third of the ~~defaults~~ misappropriated, amount viz Rs 45-1-4 may be recovered from Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasayya ~~at~~ by monthly instalments of Rs 5 the balance being struck off the accounts —

charity, and that the distribution of rice has been brought under a methodical arrangement, ~~the~~ it is ~~Govt~~ hoped that there will be no occasion for such irregularities in future. The question of double payment to one of the recipients may ~~[illegible]~~ now be dropped —

5. As regards the excess payment of Rs 135. 5. 4 ~~worth of rice~~ in connection with the rice supplied, ~~alluded to in para 3 above~~, the ~~[illegible]~~ Govt agree with the Sadar Court ~~observe~~ that ~~the~~ Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasaiyya, Dy Parpattegar Lakshmana Rao, and Shanbhogue Shamanna, who were the servants of the Chattram ~~who~~ entrusted with the maintenance of its accounts, are primarily responsible. Of these, Dy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao is reported to have died, and Shamanna to have been thrown out of employment ~~dismissed on account of his~~

~~bad conduct. The Palace Controller who was consulted on the recovery of the value of the rice misappropriated, of opinion ~~that~~ one-third of it be ordered to be made good the only remaining servant of Chatram viz the Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasaiyya, by easy instalments of Rs 5/- per mensem.~~

In these circumstances, one-third of the amount in question, ~~[illegible]~~ viz, Rs 45-1-4 ~~[illegible]~~ 8 should, as recommended, ~~therefore~~ be recovered from the Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasaiyya by monthly instalments of Rs 5, the balance being struck off the accounts. ~~and~~ The

~~This proposal is approved~~. The Palace Controller is requested to recover the amount from his pay ~~in due course~~ and credit the same to the funds of the Matu..

The accounts submitted by the Parpattegar should in future, be duly checked and examined in ~~this~~ the Palace Controller's Office and in this and in other respects the doings of the Chatram officials should be more efficiently supervised.

~~6. In conclusion, the Govt. observe that the above mentioned Shamanna has been now appointed~~

From the Palace Controller's report it appears that ~~the~~ Shanbhogue Shamanna has been since temporarily appointed as Shanbhogue in the Sri Lakshmiramanaswami temple at Mysore — As this man has shown himself in the Chatram to be an ~~to~~ unreliable person, ~~in the Chattram~~, the Govt direct that he ~~must~~ be removed from the Lakshmiramanaswami temple forthwith ~~&~~ and ~~report~~ the fact reported for their information

(Dewan's order) 3/10/04

Secretary
Muzrai Dept

Sd
3/10/04

~~as Shanbhogue in the Sri Lakshmi Ramanaswami Temple at Mysore.~~ In this connection, it has to be pointed out that after the said individual had been dismissed for misconduct in one ~~Govt~~ Muzrai Instn, his re-appointment in any capacity in another is highly ~~irregular~~ objectionable. The Palace Controller is requested to remove this man from the Sri Lakshmi Ramana swami temple and appoint a proper person in his place and report the action taken by him to Govt. at an early date.

Dewan's order

Secretary,
Muz. Deptt

To
The Palace Controller, Mysore.
" Compt. Mysore Govt

Muzrai

Read:—

Petns Regd: Nos 753 and 874, dated 25th October 1902, from one Nagesa Rao, Complaining against some of the servants of H. H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore.

And,

Correspondence ending with letter No. 14, dated 26th July 1904, from the Palace Controller, Mysore, submitting a detailed report on the above

---

Order thereon No. 1321-2
Dt 4. 10. 1904.

Certain irregularities in H. H. the Maharajas

Chattram at Mysore having been brought to the notice of Govt:, the Palace Controller was requested to enquire into and report upon the allegations contained in the complaint petitions. From the records of enquiry submitted by him it is observed, that among the irregularities brought to light only two are serious ones deserving notice, viz, (1) that a double payment of 30 seers of rice was made in the case of one of the recipients of the Kaigalarakki charity; and (2) that false accounts had been prepared and submitted to the

Palace Controller,
7 months from June
to December 1901

2 The Palace Controller Mr V N Narasimmiengar reports, after full enquiry in regard to the first named irregularity, that as a matter of fact, a double payment was actually made in the case of one of the recipients of the Charity, and in regard to the second he states that wrong accounts were submitted to his Office by the Chattram Officials from June to December 1901, and that after examination ~~it~~ it was found that a sum of Rs 135-5-4

had been shewn as paid during that period in excess of the actual amount due on the rice supplied to the Chattram. He holds three of the chief Chattram servants responsible for these irregularities, viz, the Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasaiya, the Dy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao, and the Shaubhogue Shamanna; and further recommends that as the second of the three has since and the third been thrown out of employ being a hand, one of the amount appropriated Rs 45-1-4 might be recovered from Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasayya by monthly instalments of Rs 5/- the balance being struck off the acounts.

3. On a consideration of the facts set forth above, the Government observe that the result of the investigation does not shew that there has been efficient control in the matter of the distribution of Kangalarakki. But as the Palace Controller says that tickets have been issued under his signature to each of the recipients of the charity, and

that the distribution of rice has been brought under a methodical arrangement, it is hoped that there will be no occasion for such irregularities in future. The question of double payment to one of the recipients may now be dropped.

4. As regards the excess payment of Rs135.5.4 in connection with the rice supplied, the Govt agree with the Palace Controller that Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasayya, Deputy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao and Shanbhogue Sanamma, who were the servants

of the Chatram entrusted with the maintenance of it accounts, are primarily responsible. Of these, Deputy Parpattegar Lakshman Rao is reported to have died, and Shamanna to have been thrown out of employment. In these circumstances, one-third of the amount in question, viz Rs 45-1-4, should, as recommended, be recovered from the Parpattegar Lakshmi Narasaiyya by monthly instalments of Rs 5/- the balance being struck off the accounts. The Palace Controller is requested to recover the amount from his pay and credit the same to the funds of the Institution.

5. The accounts submitted by the Parpattegar should, in future, be duly checked and examined in the Palace Controller's Office and in this and in other respects the doings of the Chattram Officials should be more efficiently supervised

6. From the Palace Controller's report it appears that Shanbhogue Shamanna has been since temporarily appointed as Shanbhogue in the Sri Lakshmiramanaswami

temple at Mysore.
As this man has
shewn himself in the
Chattram to be an
unreliable person,
the Government direct
that he be removed
from the Lakshmi
ramanaswami temple
forthwith and the
fact reported for
their information.

(Dewans order) Dft. 3/10/04
Secretary

To,
The Palace Controller,
Mysore.

Compts: Mysore
Govt: